Meeting Summary
Water Quality Impact Analysis Team
March 26, 1997

Present were Ted Roefs, Jean Elder, Parviz Nader, Loren Bottorff, Wendy Halverson Martin, Ray McDowell, Earl Byron, Peter Mangarella, Carol Howe, George B. , John Dickey, and John Davis.

Attachments A - Meeting Summary from March 19, 1997, and Agenda for March 26 meeting
B - Preliminary Identification of Significant Impact
C - Approach to Writing Water Quality Impact Sections
D- Appropriate Period of Evaluation: Water Quality Data/CALFED Impact Analysis.
E - Draft CALFED Watershed Management Policy

Overall Approach (Much of the meeting discussion concerned the overall approach. The following paragraphs are a reflection and extension of that discussion).

It is proposed that the 32 water quality actions identified through the Water Quality Technical Group be consolidated into broader categories that are more appropriate to the programmatic level of detail. As an example, an action might be to reduce selenium concentrations entering the San Joaquin River and Delta from subsurface agricultural drainage into the San Joaquin River. There may be several means of accomplishing the action, perhaps including treatment, improved water use efficiency, land use conversion, or other means. The benefits to and impacts on the San Joaquin River and Delta would be the same irrespective of how the action was accomplished. These overall impacts would be identified, as would the specific impacts that would be associated with each method of accomplishing the action.

Actions will have *performance targets*. For example, an action might be to "reduce copper loading to the Sacramento River above Hamilton City through control of acid mine drainage from inactive and abandoned mines from 30,000 lbs/yr. to 5,000 lbs/yr." (The numbers used are only hypothetical). Associated with this *performance target* might be the *environmental target* of 5 ug/L copper in the Sacramento River above Hamilton City (taken from the Water Quality Control Plan). The *performance target* would be based on a level of improvement that is technically feasible and cost effective, and that may result in attainment of the *environmental target*. When measures are implemented to achieve the *performance target*, an evaluation will be made as to whether the *environmental target* has been met. If not, further corrective actions would be taken, using the concept of adaptive management. This approach overcomes a serious problem with being able to establish realistic targets for water quality improvement resulting from implementation of specific actions. For instance, we can estimate the copper loading to the Sacramento River, and can estimate how the loading would be reduced if corrective measures are implemented. However, we cannot quantatively predict how this reduction will affect the concentrations in the Sacramento River.

Preliminary Work Plan - Comments on the preliminary workplan (See Attachment A): Task 3 should be high priority. Add to the end of Task 5, "and sources and timeframes to support impact analysis.". Change first sentence of Task 8 to read, "The deliverable will be an Impact Analyusis technical appendix that identifies potentially significant impacts and identifies potential mitigation measures." With these changes, the work plan is adopted.

Document Review Attachments B, C, and D were handed out and explained by the consultant team. No significant objections were stated to the approaches suggested by these documents. A comment on Attachment D was that we should review how much sediment data exists, and we need to compute loadings to determine how important each source is. Forward any further comments to Rick Woodard by April 2, 1997.

Other Comments - The watershed management policy CALFED is developing was discussed. Attachment E is the draft policy.

0329IAT